

## REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application in which claims 1, 14 and 24 are independent.

Claims 1, 14 and 24 have been amended to more precisely claim that which Applicant regards as his invention. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action objects to the title of the invention alleging that it is neither descriptive nor precise. While the Applicant disagrees, the title of the invention has been amended to be more descriptive. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action rejects claims 24-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant amended claim 24 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to make clear that the executable code is stored in at least one machine readable medium. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24-30 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 24-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 alleging the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as being an intangible media and an abstract idea. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant amended claim 24 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to make clear that the program product is tangibly embodied or stored in at least one machine readable medium. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Raghunandan (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,885). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Raghunandan describes an email processing method and system that is fundamentally different than Applicant's claimed invention. As the background description focuses,

Raghunandan addresses the amount of time spent on responding to incoming emails (the "pain" that will be solved by Raghunandan's disclosure). However, central to Raghunandan is a system where reply emails (i.e., emails that are sent back to a sender) are automatically sent in response to incoming emails. The disclosure of Raghunandan is directed solely to automatic replies to incoming mail. On the other hand, the claimed invention addresses a very different concept which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Raghunandan. Specifically, Raghunandan fails to disclose a method, apparatus and computer program product that attends to email sent to an intended recipient, that formats the email according to an attribute identified by text parsing, and that sends the formatted mail to the intended recipient.

As for claim 1, Raghunandan fails to disclose or suggest "receiving from the e-mail composer *an e-mail message that is addressed to an intended recipient*; text-parsing the received e-mail for identifying an e-mail attribute; *formatting the received e-mail message in accordance with a predetermined format corresponding to the identified e-mail attribute*; and *sending the formatted e-mail message to the intended recipient*," as claim 1 recites. (Emphasis added).

Raghunandan also fails to disclose as claim 14 recites "a server *configured to receive an e-mail message addressed to an intended recipient and to send a formatted e-mail message to the intended recipient*," as claim 14 recites. (Emphasis added). Specifically, Raghunandan fails to disclose a server to include "an e-mail formatter for identifying an e-mail attribute by text-parsing the e-mail message addressed to the intended recipient; a template manager for assigning a predetermined format in accordance with the e-mail attribute; and a message assembler for assembling the formatted e-mail message to include at least the content of the e-mail message addressed to the intended recipient in accordance with a specific format designated by the assigned predetermined format," as claim 14 recites.

Lastly, for the same reasons discussed above, Raghunandan fails to disclose “text-parsing an e-mail *addressed to an intended recipient* and received from an e-mail composer for identifying an e-mail attribute in the header or body of the e-mail; *formatting the e-mail in accordance with a predetermined format corresponding to the identified e-mail attribute*; and *sending the formatted e-mail message to the intended recipient*,” as claim 24 recites. (Emphasis added).


Because Raghunandan fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 14 and 24, a showing of anticipation has not been made. Moreover, there is no showing of anticipation for the claims that depend from claims 1, 14, and 24. The § 102(e) is submitted to be improper and is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

As all issues have been addressed and presumably overcome, this application now stands in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

 #46,692  
for David M. Tennant  
Registration No. 48,362

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 DT:MaM  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: September 20, 2007**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**